

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI  
CENTRAL DIVISION**

PATRICK ROMANO, et al.,	)	
	)	
	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Case No. 2:23-CV-04043-BCW
	)	
TORCH ELECTRONICS, LLC, et al.,	)	
	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**ORDER**

Before the Court is Plaintiffs’ motion to extend the page limit. (Doc. #31). The Court, being duly advised of the premises, denies said motion.

On May 5, 2023, Plaintiffs filed the instant motion requesting to exceed the page limit set by Local Rule 7.0<sup>1</sup> for their suggestions in support of their motion for class certification. (Doc. #31). Plaintiffs request an additional 15 pages and note their motion is unopposed by Defendants provided the Court also grant Defendants an additional 15 pages for their forthcoming suggestions in opposition.

Although a Scheduling Order has not yet been entered in the above-captioned matter, the future Scheduling Order will note that this Court does not commonly grant motions to exceed the page limit set forth in Local Rule 7.0. And here, the Court denies Plaintiffs’ motion because they have not provided sufficient reasoning regarding why an additional 15 pages for argument is necessary. Furthermore, the Court would not grant such a motion on the basis that Defendants also

---

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to Local Rule 7.0(d)(1)(A) & (B), the argument section of supporting suggestions and opposing suggestions may not exceed 15 pages unless the parties obtain leave of Court.

receive an additional 15 pages for argument in their opposition without an explanation from Defendants regarding why an additional 15 pages is necessary. Plaintiffs' motion is therefore denied. Accordingly, it is hereby

ORDERED Plaintiffs' motion to extend the page limit (Doc. #31) is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: May 12, 2023

/s/ Brian C. Wimes

JUDGE BRIAN C. WIMES

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT